

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 41 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1 – 41 are presently rejected.

By this response, claims 1, 14, 21, and 40 have been amended. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection**

Claims 1 – 32, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0119581 (“Cannon”).

Independent claims 1, 14, 21 and 40 have been amended.

Claims 1, 14, 21 and 40, as now amended, are directed to a gaming system that includes a plurality of gaming machines. Each of the gaming machines includes first and second displays, and is linked to a remote display that is controlled by a remote system controller. After triggering a feature game, a first image content is displayed on the second display, and second image content is displayed on the remote display. The first image content cooperates with at least certain of the different second image content on the remote display to communicate an outcome of a feature game. The feature game awards 1) a fixed prize and 2) a progressive prize. When the game controller of a gaming machine awards the fixed prize, the gaming machine notifies the remote system controller about the awarding of the fixed prize. In response to the game controller awarding the fixed prize, the system controller displays details of the fixed prize on the remote display.

Support of the amendment can be found in the Specification, e.g. paragraph [00558].

Cannon does not anticipate claims 1, 14, 21, and 40.

At best, Cannon discloses a bonus game apparatus 242, a bonus event computer 240, and a bonus game controller 280 that can be used to conduct a bonus game.

However, Cannon does not disclose a bonus game that has a fixed prize and a progressive prize, let alone a controller that notifies a system controller about the awarding of the fixed prize,

and in response to the game controller awarding the fixed prize, a system controller that displays details of the fixed prize on the remote display.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 40 are not anticipated by Cannon, and are allowable.

Claims 2 – 13, claims 15 – 20, claims 22 – 39, and claim 41 depend from claims 1, 14, 21, and 40, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 – 13, 15 – 20, 22 – 39, and 41 are not anticipated by Cannon for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 14, 21, and 40.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection**

Claims 33 – 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon.

It cannot be said that Cannon renders obvious independent claims 21 and 40. As discussed above, Cannon discloses a bonus game apparatus 242, a bonus event computer 240, and a bonus game controller 280 that can be used to conduct a bonus game. However, as discussed above, Cannon does not disclose a bonus game that has both a fixed prize and a progressive prize. Nor does Cannon's gaming machine notify a system controller that a fixed prize has been awarded. Nor does Cannon's system controller respond to such a notification of an awarding of a fixed prize, by displaying details of the fixed prize on the remote display.

Since each of these separate differences are not taught by Cannon (no bonus game that has a fixed prize and a progressive prize; no notification by a gaming machine to a system controller that a fixed prize has been awarded by a gaming machine; no displaying by the system controller of the details of the fixed prize on a remote display), it cannot be said that there is any teaching or motivation to do so. To do so would cause a complete change in Cannon's gaming system, and thus it is not obvious to do so.

Therefore, claims 21 and 40 are patentable over Cannon, and allowable.

Therefore, claims 33 – 39, and 41 are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 21 and 40.

**CONCLUSION**

Entry of the Amendment and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.  
The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 10, 2011

By: /Larry M. Jarvis/  
Larry M. Jarvis  
Reg. No. 27,341  
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street, 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
Phone: (312) 775-8000  
Fax: (312) 775-8100